

Appn. S.N. 10/695,306  
Amdt. dated November 4, 2005  
Reply to Office Action of August 5, 2005  
Docket No. 100204708-1

11

#### REMARKS

The Office Action of August 5, 2005 has been received and carefully reviewed. It is submitted that, by this Amendment, all bases of rejection and objection are traversed and overcome. Upon entry of this Amendment, claims 1-55 remain in the application. Reconsideration of the claims as currently set forth is requested.

Claims 1, 4-22, 42-43, 45-46, 51 and 53 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Sharma et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,021,398). Specifically regarding claims 1, 21-22, 42-43, 45-46, 51 and 53, the Examiner states that Sharma discloses a method to produce a patterned superconducting solid that includes depositing a liquid precursor solution onto a substrate, thereby forming a liquid film, the liquid precursor solution having at least one soluble inorganic metal salt dissolved into a photoresist; patterning the liquid film; and heating the patterned liquid film, thereby producing the patterned ceramic film; wherein the patterned ceramic film is adapted for use as at least one of ion-conducting ceramics, electrodes, hard ceramic coatings, transparent conducting oxides, transparent semiconducting oxides, ferroelectric oxides, and dielectric oxides.

Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's assertion that Sharma discloses a liquid precursor solution having at least one soluble **inorganic** metal salt dissolved into a photoresist. Sharma teaches that **organic** metal salts are dissolved in organic solvents. Sharma nowhere teaches or suggests the use of inorganic metal salts.

In sharp contrast, Applicants' invention as defined in claims 1, 22-23, 42-43, 45-46, 51 and 53 recites that an **inorganic** metal salt is dissolved into a photoresist.

As such, it is submitted that Applicants' invention as defined in claims 1, 22-23, 42-43, 45-46, 51 and 53, and in those claims depending ultimately therefrom is not anticipated, taught or rendered obvious by the cited reference, either alone or in combination, and patentably defines over the art of record.

Claims 23-28 and 30-41 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sharma in view of Asakawa et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,565,763).

Appln. S.N. 10/695,306  
Amdt. dated November 4, 2005  
Reply to Office Action of August 5, 2005  
Docket No. 100204708-1

12

Applicants respectfully submit that Sharma does not teach a fuel cell having a patterned ceramic film formed from an **Inorganic** metal salt dissolved in a photoresist. Thus, the combination of Sharma and Asakawa does not render Applicants' invention as defined in claims 23-28 and 30-41.

As such, it is submitted that Applicants' invention as defined in claims 23 and 41, and in those claims depending ultimately therefrom is not anticipated, taught or rendered obvious by the cited reference, either alone or in combination, and patentably defines over the art of record.

Claim 29 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sharma and Asakawa in view of Lu (U.S. Patent No. 6,177,357).

Reiterating the above arguments, Sharma does not teach a fuel cell having a patterned ceramic film formed from an **inorganic** salt dissolved in a photoresist. Thus, the combination of Sharma, Asakawa, and Lu does not render Applicants' invention as defined in claim 29.

As such, it is submitted that Applicants' invention as defined in claim 29 is not anticipated, taught or rendered obvious by the cited reference, either alone or in combination, and patentably defines over the art of record.

Claims 50 and 55 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sharma in view of Kasano et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,194,129).

Again reiterating the above arguments, Sharma fails to teach forming a patterned ceramic film from a liquid precursor having at least one soluble **Inorganic** metal salt dissolved into a photoresist.

As such, it is submitted that Applicants' invention as defined in claims 50 and 55, and those claims depending ultimately therefrom is not anticipated, taught or rendered obvious by the cited reference, either alone or in combination, and patentably defines over the art of record.

Applicants note the Examiner's indication of allowable subject matter in claims 2, 3, 24, 47, 52 and 54.

Appn. S.N. 10/695,306  
Amdt. dated November 4, 2005  
Reply to Office Action of August 5, 2005  
Docket No. 100204708-1

13

In summary, claims 1-55 remain in the application. It is submitted that, through this Amendment, Applicants' invention as set forth in these claims is now in a condition suitable for allowance.

Further and favorable consideration is requested. If the Examiner believes it would expedite prosecution of the above-identified application, the Examiner is cordially invited to contact Applicants' Attorney at the below-listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,

DIERKER & ASSOCIATES, P.C.



Julia Church Dierker  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 33368  
(248) 649-9900  
juliad@troypatent.com

3331 West Big Beaver Rd.  
Suite 109  
Troy, Michigan 48084

Dated: November 4, 2005  
JCD/JRK/jrk